



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

dependent upon him." This is the view adopted in a number of the States. *Hatch v. Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 120 Mass. 550; *Breasted v. Far. Loan & Trust Co.*, 8 N. Y. 299, 59 Am. Dec. 482; *Mooney v. Ancient Order*, 24 Ky. L. Rep. 1787, 72 S. W. 288; *Supreme Commandery Knights of Golden Rule v. Ainsworth*, 71 Ala. 436, 46 Am. Rep. 332; and is the general rule in England; *Amicable Society v. Bolland*, 4 Bligh. (N. S.) 194; *Borradaile v. Hunter*, 5 Man. & G. 639; *Clift v. Schwabe*, 3 C. B. 437. A dissenting opinion in the principal case is based on the theory that the provision of the GEORGIA CODE, 1910, § 2500, renders the latter view obligatory upon the Georgia court.

JUDGMENT—COLLATERAL ATTACK ON JUDGMENT OF PROBATE COURT.—On a bill by a guardian of an incompetent, praying sale and partition of lands, defendant demurred on the ground that the adjudication of incompetency and the appointment of complainant were void because the record showed that the finding of insanity was by a jury of less than the statutory number. *Held*, the demurrer was properly overruled, for the reason that an inquisition by an agreed jury of ten was merely an irregularity, and did not render the appointment subject to collateral attack. *Powell v. Union Bank & Trust Co.* (Ala. 1911) 56 South. 123.

By the weight of authority in this country the judgments of a probate court cannot be attacked in a collateral proceeding. GARY'S PROBATE LAW, § 23, p. 12, and cases cited; *Dayton v. Mintzer*, 22 Minn. 393; *Tebbetts v. Tilton*, 24 N. H. 120; *Dodge v. Cole*, 97 Ill. 338; and *Craft v. Simon*, 118 Ala. 625. On collateral attack the court presumes that the court in the former case acted correctly and with due authority, and its record is valid as to all jurisdictional facts appearing of record. *Crown Real Estate Co. v. Rogers*, 132 Ky. 790. Records of probate courts import absolute verity and are not subject to collateral attack, *Heckman v. Adams*, 50 Ohio St. 305. An order appointing a guardian of an incompetent in the absence of direct attack is presumed to have been correctly made. *Isaacs v. Jones*, 121 Cal. 257. The general rule is that juries must consist of twelve men, and such fact must appear of record, and when a record shows that a cause was tried by a jury of less than twelve men the trial will be held to be a nullity. THOMPSON AND MERRIAM, JURIES, §§ 5 and 6, and cases cited. On the number of jurors see also 5 BACON'S ABRIDGMENT, p. 314, title Juries A; and 2 HALE, PLEAS OF THE CROWN, p. 161. Where the record recites a jury of twelve, a court of appeal will presume that there were twelve men though only eleven names appear. *Foote v. Lawrence*, 1 Stew. 483. Though the main case conflicts with many adjudicated cases in regard to the number of jurors, and no case exactly in point has been found, it is believed that the case follows the better rule in holding judgments not subject to collateral attack for mere irregularities in procedure. See 1 MICH. L. REV. 645.

MINES AND MINERALS—OWNERSHIP—ESTATE IN UNDISCOVERED MINERALS.—Complainant was the holder of a tax title on certain lands originally owned in fee by X and Y, who had conveyed said lands by a quit-claim deed containing an exception and reservation of all metals or ores in, upon or under